



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the continued use of Adonis-gardens in the worship of John the Baptist, and by various other details. The result of the study is that an Adonis festival was modified by the Ionic Greeks and adopted into their own Anthesteria; that John took the place of Adonis in Malta when Christianity was introduced; that at some time after Suleiman the date of the festival was changed until after Easter, so that its celebration might not interfere with Lent, and that when the statue of the Baptist found its fixed place in the cathedral at Valetta, many pagan elements were excluded, though the *misericordia*, followed by the mass and the procession, with all kinds of popular amusements, remain to this day. In many details the author is not convincing, and the argument as a whole might be stronger if some weak points were omitted. The adoption of a heathen festival into local Christian usage, and the gradual exclusion of pagan elements, seems to be proved in this as in many other instances.—ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

La question biblique chez les Catholiques de France au XIX^e siècle. Par Albert Houtin. (Paris: Picard, 1902; pp. iv+324.) The title of this volume exactly represents its contents. The book is a review of French Catholic opinion of the Bible during the nineteenth century. M. Houtin's method is chronological. He first formulates the current belief about the year 1800 of Christians, as well Protestants as Catholics, concerning the age of the world and the history of man, and shows the source of that belief in the assumed historicity of the Genesis narratives. He illustrates this belief by quoting Archbishop Le Coz, who rejected a savant's proposition to put the "age of the sages" about 6000 B.C., implying a still earlier origin of the universe, on the insufficient ground, so the archbishop thought, of researches in natural science. The church had been unmoved by the scientific advance, by the results of philosophical and historical research, during the eighteenth century. It regarded with disdain scientific efforts for truth, considered the war of rival scientific theories proof of the emptiness of scientific research, and asserted that "the narrative of Moses is a defense to its defenders." Scientific theory is "both danger and superfluity, Genesis is sufficient." The author carries the reader on by periods marked out, not by arbitrarily assumed periods, such, for example, as decades, but by events in the world of science or literature. Thus his first period is 1800-1830, characterized by the first conflicts over Gen., chap. 1, and over Egyptology, by the "secularization of science," and by the birth of the science of religion. The next

period ends with the year 1843, and includes the time of issue of Strauss's *Leben Jesu*. Thus each of the seventeen chapters gives a clear-cut review of the salient events affecting biblical science in France or outside during the period it treats. A view of the management of discussion may be had by reading the headings of chap. 12. "Variations on a great biblical miracle, 'the real miracle,' the deluge universal. The deluge limited a little: Deluc, Cuvier, Wallon, Daras, le père Brucker. The deluge still more limited: d'Omalius, Motais, Charles Robert. The deluge very limited: MM. Suess and de Girard. Just a little more deluge: M. de Kirwan—a scientific concession. No deluge at all: MM. de Lapparent and Loisy." The volume is an excellent instance of the fine historical work the French school is doing. American students are hardly awake to the fact that the French are, in treating historical subjects, superior to the Germans; that they are broader, less subject to attacks of finical extravagance, less exposed to that demoralizing competition for position which seems to make almost necessary the discovery of something new under the sun, however *outré* that something new may be. And the fine bibliography of thirty-six pages adds greatly to the value of the work.—GEO. W. GILMORE.

The Song of Solomon, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. By Andrew Harper. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1902; pp. li+96; 1s. 6d.) Eleven years ago Canon Driver barely alluded to the significant publication of Wetzstein in relation to the "Song of Songs," and spoke of the dramatic theory of the poem as "accepted by the majority of modern critics and commentators." In the work now before us it is admitted that the Wetzstein-Budde theory of the poem as a collection of wedding songs "may almost be said to hold the field at present." With a fair-mindedness characteristic of the book throughout, these opposing views are carefully discussed in the introduction and appendix. In general, the author adopts the dramatic view with points of resemblance to Rothstein with whom he agrees in recognizing that older wedding songs may be incorporated, and in maintaining that Budde's recognition of a redactor's hand points toward a dramatic conception of the whole. He classes the poem as a dramatic lyric rather than an elaborated drama, likening it to Browning's *In a Gondola*. He fails, however, to give any ancient, much less any Semitic, analogue for this literary type. The detailed arguments point out with acumen the many difficulties in Budde's view, but